UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| 10/812,252 | 03/29/2004 | John W. Rohrer | | 2743 |
| John W. Rohre | 7590 05/23/2007 | | EXAM | INER |
| Rohrer Technologies, Inc. 5 Long Cove Rd. York, ME 03909 | | | BLAU, STEPHEN LUTHER | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3711 | |
| • | | | | • |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 05/23/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| W | ١ |
|---|---|
| | |

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| 10/812,252 | ROHRER, JOHN W. | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| Stephen L. Blau | 3711 | |

| | Stephen L. Diau | 3711 | |
|--|--|--|---|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appear | ars on the cover sheet with the d | correspondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>27 April 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI | ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL | LOWANCE. | • |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods: | the same day as filing a Notice of ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in | Appeal. To avoid aba fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C | nce, which FR 41.31; or (3) |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date | of the final rejection. | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la | | | |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70 | 06.07(f). | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply ong than three months after the mailing da | of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Offi | ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of th | ns of the date of e appeal. Since |
| | | | |
| 3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further core (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below.) | nsideration and/or search (see NO | | ecause |
| (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or | | ducing or simplifying | the issues for |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a | corresponding number of finally rej | ected claims. | |
| NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1) | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | | mpliant Amendment | (PTOL-324) |
| 5. 🔯 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | | (|
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | owable if submitted in a separate, | | • |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proving. | \boxtimes will not be entered, or b) \square wirided below or appended. | II be entered and an ε | explanation of |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: <u>As stated in the Final Office Action</u> . Claim(s) objected to: <u>As stated in the Final Office Action</u> . | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: As stated in the Final Office Action. | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: As stated in the Fi | nal Office Action. | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | |
| B. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | t before or on the date of filing a N I sufficient reasons why the affidat | otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence is | t be entered necessary and |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome all rejections under appe | al and/or appellant fai | ls to provide a |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | | | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but | does NOT place the application in | n condition for allowar | nce because: |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. Other: | | Start | - Klau |
| • | | STEPHEN | BLAU |
| | • | PRIMARY EX | AMINER |

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Application No. 10/812,252

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The changes to how the forward extending section connects to the shaft in claim 1 requires further consideration and/or searching. In addition, adding the term "said shaft connection" in claims 3 and 6 requires further consideration.

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): The changes to the specification are agreed with and the objections are removed. Removing the term "other shaft connecting means" is agreed with but still having the forward extending section connecting to a straight or a bent shaft maintains questions of the drawings not showing these elements. Even if the elements of structure of the shaft being straight or bent are removed further consideration would be required for the changes to the claims.